Cavitt Creek Road-Related Restoration

FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT (FONSI)

The Swiftwater Field Office, Roseburg District, Bureau of Land Management, has analyzed a proposal called the **Cavitt Creek Road-Related Restoration**. In the proposed action road decommissioning, road treatments and culvert replacements or removals would occur in the Little River Watershed.

The Environmental Assessment (EA), OR-104-01-10, contains a description and analysis of the proposed action. A summary of the analysis contained in the EA shows:

- 1). The project would not be expected to impact any special status plants (EA, page 12) or cultural resources (EA, page 12).
- 2). Consultation with U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service for this project has been completed. The Biological Opinion (May 31, 2001) concluded that the action is "... not likely to adversely affect the spotted owl, murrelet, or bald eagle".
- 3). A Biological Opinion (July 12, 2001) has been received from the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) and concluded that the action "is not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of . . . OC coho salmon, or OC steelhead."

This proposal is in conformance with the "Final - Roseburg District Proposed Resource Management Plan / Environmental Impact Statement (PRMP/EIS) dated October 1994 and its associated Roseburg District Record of Decision and Resources Management Plan (RMP) dated June 2, 1995; and The Land and Resource Management Plan for the Umpqua National Forest (October 5, 1990), as amended. This proposal is located on lands within the Little River Adaptive Management Area. Two alternatives were analyzed: the "no action" and "Proposed Action" alternatives.

<u>Finding of No Significant Impacts:</u> I have reviewed the tests of significance as described in 40 CFR 1508.27 (see attached). Based on the site specific analysis summarized in the EA and noted above, it is my determination that the proposed action does not constitute a major federal action with significant impacts to the quality of the human environment therefore an Environmental Impact Statement does not need to be prepared. I further find that the proposed activity is consistent with the Aquatic Conservation Strategy objectives and meets or does not prevent attainment of these objectives.

| Jay K. Carlson Swiftwater Field Manager | Date |
|--|------|
| | |
| Carol Cushing North Umpqua District Ranger | Date |

Cavitt Creek Road-Related Restoration

Test for Significant Impacts. $(40\ CFR\ 1508.27)$

| Has impacts (both beneficial and adverse) determined to be severe? Remarks: | () Yes | (/) No |
|---|---|---|
| Has significant adverse impacts on public health or safety? Remarks: Considering the remoteness of the project to local population governing the proposal (EA, pg. 8 through 10), the likelihood of the prosafety is remote and speculative. | | • |
| 3. Adversely effects such unique geographic characteristics as historic or culturefuge lands, wilderness areas, wild or scenic rivers, sole or principal drinking wetlands, floodplains or ecologically significant or critical areas including those list Register of Natural Landmarks? Remarks: Reviews (Cultural, Recreation, Wildlife, Hydrology and F proposed action would adversely affect any of the above characteristics) | water aquifers, prim ted on the Departme () Yes Fisheries) do not sh | e farmlands, ent's National (\(\sigma \) No now that the |
| Has highly controversial effects on the quality of the human environment? Remarks: No highly controversial effects were noted as a result of ereview. | () Yes environmental analy | (√) No sis or public |
| 5. Has highly uncertain and potentially significant environmental effects of environmental risks? Remarks: The analysis does not indicate that this action would involve | () Yes | (/) No |
| 6. Establishes a precedent for future action or represents a decision in prince potentially significant environmental effects? Remarks: The advertisement and award of contracts for road decommissand repair of roads is a well-established practice and does not establish | () Yes ssioning, replacemen | (\checkmark) No at of culverts, |
| 7. Is directly related to other actions with individually insignificant but cumulatively Remarks: We find that this action would not have a cumulatively significant beyond that already identified in the FSEIS. | () Yes | (/) No |
| 8. Has adverse effects on properties listed or eligible for listing on the National Remarks: The EA (pg. 12) does not indicate that this action would structures, or objects listed in or eligible for listing in the National Regist | () Yes I not adversely affe | (✓) No ect any sites, |

| 9. May adversely affect an endangered or threatened species or its habitat that h | nas been determined t | to be critical |
|--|-----------------------|-----------------|
| under the Endangered Species Act of 1973? | | |
| Aquatic Species | () Yes | (✓) No |
| Botanical Species | () Yes | (✓) No |
| Terrestrial Species | () Yes | (✓) No |
| Remarks: Consultation with NMFS has been completed. The Biological Opinion (July 12, | | |
| 2001) concluded that the action "is not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of OC coho | | |
| salmon, or OC steelhead". Botanical surveys did not identify the presence of any T&E plants | | |
| therefore consultation was not required. Consultation with U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service for this | | |
| project has been completed. The Biological Opinion (May 31, 2001) of | concluded that the ac | tion |
| is " not likely to adversely affect "the spotted owl, murrelet, or bald | d eagle. | |

10. Threatens to violate Federal, State, local, or tribal law or requirements imposed for the protection of the environment? ()Yes (✓) No

Remarks: We find that this action would not threaten a violation of Federal, State, local or tribal law imposed for the protection of the environment.